

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 17-21, 23 and 34 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-6 of the Reply. Applicant's representative thanks Examiner Zhen for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview conducted on May 19, 2008. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-22 and 34-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-22 and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 and 34 have been amended herein to recite a useful, concrete and tangible result. In addition, claim 16 has been canceled. In light of the amendments, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-23 and 25-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-7, 9-23 and 25-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hutsch *et al.* (US Patent 7,269,664). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Hutsch *et al.* does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim.*** *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The ***identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.*** *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicant's claimed invention relates to an architecture that facilitates integration of data among applications that are individually architected and/or non-integrated. To this end, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 23 and 34) recites *a system that facilitates the interface of non-integrated applications, comprising an artifact provider that hosts artifacts*

of a first application, the artifacts include items of data the first application publicly exposes to other applications, each artifact is associated with an artifact type, the artifact type can be at least one of a source file, a defect, a requirement, a test result or a build and an artifact consumer that exposes at least one reference held by a second application, the reference is a link to at least one of the artifacts of the first application hosted by the artifact provider, the link further comprises a link type that describes a relationship between the artifact consumer and the artifact provider. Hutsch *et al.* does not disclose, teach or suggest such aspects.

Rather, Hutsch *et al.* relates to a network portal system that enables user devices of differing capabilities to view, edit and/or manage content from a plurality of content providers. In one aspect, the user devices employ web browsers to access the network portal system and the content providers. The portal system requests the data in accordance with user requests received via the user devices. The portal system further presents or stylizes the requested content based upon the display capabilities of the user device. However, Hutsch *et al.* does not disclose an artifact provider as in the subject claims. An artifact provider includes artifacts wherein an artifact is data publicly exposed by an application. The artifact can be of an artifact type, such as, a source file, a defect, a requirement, a test result or a build. Hutsch *et al.* discloses content providers that retain content (e.g., in a raw or formatted manner) that can be accessed and presented on a plurality of devices. Moreover, Hutsch *et al.* is silent regarding an artifact consumer that exposes a reference held by another application separate from the artifact provider. The reference is a link that comprises a link type describing a relationship between the artifact consumer and the artifact provider. Hutsch *et al.* does not disclose a type that describes a relationship between a content provider and a user device (e.g. client).

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Hutsch *et al.*, neither discloses, teaches nor suggests, each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 23 and 34 (and associated dependent claims). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Hutsch *et al.* does not anticipate the applicant's claimed invention and, therefore, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 8 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch *et al.*, in view of Chang *et al.* (US Publication 2004/0215635). It is respectfully

requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 8 and 24 depends from independent claims 1 and 23 respectively. Chang *et al.* does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Hutsch *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 23.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP586US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731